



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,994	10/21/2003	Edgar B. Cahoon	BB1295USCNT	1315

23906 7590 08/24/2006

E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY  
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER  
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128  
4417 LANCASTER PIKE  
WILMINGTON, DE 19805

EXAMINER

ZHENG, LI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1638

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/690,994

Applicant(s)

CAHOON ET AL.

Examiner

Li Zheng

Art Unit

1638

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/15/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, 21, 23 and 24, drawn to nucleotide sequences; the genetic construct comprising the nucleotide sequences, and host cell containing said nucleotide sequence, classified in class 435, subclass 320.1, for example.
- II. Claims 12-14 and 22, drawn to a polypeptide, and composition of polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 370, for example.
- III. Claims 15-16, drawn to a method of selecting polynucleotide that affects the level of a DGAT in a plant cell using nucleotide sequences of at least 30 contiguous nucleotides from SEQ ID NO: 1-21, classified in class 800, subclass 281, for example.
- IV. Claim 17, drawn to a method of selecting polynucleotide that affects the level of a DGAT in a plant cell using isolated nucleotide sequence of claim 1, classified in class 435, subclass 468, for example.
- V. Claim 18, drawn to a method of obtaining a nucleotide sequence encoding a DGAT by using PCR amplification, classified in class 536 , subclass 23.4, for example.

- VI. Claim 19, drawn to a method of obtaining a nucleotide sequence encoding a DGAT by using hybridization, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3, for example.
- VII. Claim 20, drawn to a method of evaluating compound for its ability to inhibit the activity of DGAT, classified in class 435, subclass 6, for example.
- VIII. Claim 25, drawn to a method of positive selection of a transformed cell, classified in class 800, subclass 281, for example.

Inventions II and inventions III-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, methods of inventions III-VIII do not use polypeptide sequences of invention II. Furthermore, searching any of invention II and any of inventions III-VIII together would impose an undue search burden. In the instant case, prior art search for polypeptide sequence and the different steps used in the methods are not coextensive. A search of each of these inventions would require different key word searches of each compound, and each step, of the methods, using divergent patent and non-patent literature databases. The different searches would then require subsequent in-depth

analysis of the unrelated prior art literature, placing a serious burden on the Office in terms of both search and examination.

Invention I is patentably distinct from invention II. The polypeptide of invention II and polynucleotide of invention I are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleotide sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In addition, a polypeptide of invention II can also be made by means that do not require the polynucleotide of invention I. The polypeptide can be recovered from a natural source using by biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, invention I and invention II are patentably distinct. Furthermore, searching inventions I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. Inventions I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides that would not have described polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have

Art Unit: 1638

been "classical" genetics papers that had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive. As such, it would be burdensome to search inventions I and II together.

Inventions I and III- VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the nucleotide sequence of invention I can be used in different methods as evidenced at least by the methods of inventions III-VIII. Furthermore, searching invention I and any of inventions III-VIII together would impose an undue search burden. In the instant case, prior art search for the different nucleotide sequences and steps used in the methods are not coextensive. A search of each of these inventions would require different key word searches of each compound, and each step, of the methods, using divergent patent and non-patent literature databases. The different searches would then require subsequent in-depth analysis of the unrelated prior art literature, placing a serious burden on the Office in terms of both search and examination.

Inventions III-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, inventions III-IV are designed for selecting polynucleotide that affects the level of a DGAT in a plant cell. Inventions V and VI are designed for obtaining a nucleotide sequence encoding a DGAT by using hybridization, whereas inventions VII and VIII are designed for evaluating compound for its ability to inhibit the activity of DGAT and positive selection of a transformed cell, respectively. Each group encompasses different steps. Invention V uses PCR amplification whereas invention VI employs hybridization method. Further more, searching any of inventions III-VIII together would impose an undue search burden. In the instant case, prior art search for the different constructs and steps used in the methods are not coextensive. A search of each of these inventions would require different key word searches of each step, of the methods, using divergent patent and non-patent literature databases. The different searches would then require subsequent in-depth analysis of the unrelated prior art literature, placing a serious burden on the Office in terms of both search and examination.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: different host cells in invention I. The species are independent or distinct because they belong to different kingdoms in taxonomy.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 8 and 9 is generic. Please note that there could be a potential typographic error in claim 10, because the claim is drawn to the isolated host cell of claim 7, but claim 7 is not drawn to a host cell.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicants are reminded that different nucleotide sequences and amino acid sequences are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence and each amino acid sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq.



For each of inventions I, II, III, IV, VIII above, restriction to one of the polypeptides of SEQ ID NO: 2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20, and 22 is also required under 35 USC 121.

For inventions V and VI above, additional restriction to one of the corresponding nucleotide sequences of SEQ ID NO: 1,3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19, and 21 is also required under 35 USC 121.

Claims that do not read on the elected nucleotide sequence or polypeptide sequence will be considered withdrawn. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the nucleotide sequence or polypeptide sequence that is selected. An election that does not identify the nucleotide sequence or polypeptide sequence will be considered nonresponsive. This requirement is not to be construed as a requirement for an election of species, since each nucleotide and amino acid sequence is not a member of single genus of invention, but constitutes an independent and patentably distinct invention.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process


claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li Zheng whose telephone number is 571-272-8031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg can be reached on 571-272-0975. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1638

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ashwin D. Menta'.

**ASHWIN D. MENTA, PH.D.**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**